```
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
                      IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10
                    FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11
   The United State of America for
12
   the Use and Benefit of THE BEEBE
                                              2:05-cv-685-GEB-KJM
   CORPORATION, a California
13
   corporation,
14
                         Plaintiff,
                                              ORDER DISMISSING ACTION
15
              V.
   ALL POWER, INC., a California
16
   corporation; and ST. PAUL/
17
   TRAVELERS, a corporation,
18
                         Defendants.
19
   ALL POWER, INC.,
20
                   Counterclaimant,
21
              V.
22
   THE BEEBE CORPORATION, a
   California corporation,
23
                   Counterdefendant.
24
25
              On September 15, 2005, the parties filed a "Stipulation for
26
   Dismissal With Prejudice and Order" ("Stipulation") which states the
27
   parties
28
              stipulate and agree that the Complaint . . . and
              the Counterclaim . . . should be dismissed with
```

Case 2:05-cv-00685-GEB-KJM Document 12 Filed 09/29/05 Page 2 of 2

prejudice pursuant to the Mutual Release and Settlement Agreement . . . The terms of the Mutual Release and Settlement Agreement are explicitly incorporated by Plaintiff and Defendants into this Stipulation for Dismissal with Prejudice and Order. The parties hereto further stipulate, acknowledge and agree that the District Court of the United States for Eastern District of California shall retain exclusive jurisdiction to enforce the terms and provisions of the Mutual Release and Settlement Agreement.

(Stipulation at 1-2.)

I have not read the above-referenced Settlement Agreement and decline the parties' invitation to exercise jurisdiction over something I have not seen. Further, "the mere fact that the parties agree that the court should exercise continuing jurisdiction [over their Settlement Agreement] is not binding on the court." Arata v. Nu Skin Int'l Inc., 96 F.3d 1265, 1269 (9th Cir. 1996).

Inasmuch as the parties represent they have settled this action and desire it dismissed, and nothing in their Stipulation indicates the settlement is contingent upon the Court retaining jurisdiction over any aspect of their Settlement Agreement, this action is dismissed. See Oswalt v. Scripto, Inc., 616 F.2d 191, 194 (5th Cir. 1980) (revealing that when the parties' representations of settlement are tantamount to a stipulated dismissal, a dismissal order should issue). The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 28, 2005

/s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr.
GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
United States District Judge